BX
5034
R53



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA

PRESENTED BY
PROF. CHARLES A. KOFOID AND
MRS. PRUDENCE W. KOFOID

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/churchprogressch00richrich

Alexander Griffith
1858

CHURCH PROGRESS.

A CHARGE

DELIVERED

TO THE CLERGY

OF

THE DIOCESE OF WINCHESTER.

BY

CHARLES RICHARD,

BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,

PRELATE OF THE ORDER OF THE GARTER.

AT HIS

EIGHTH VISITATION,

IN SEPTEMBER,

1858.

LONDON:
THOMAS HATCHARD, 187 PICCADILLY, W.
1858.

Kofoid

LONDON:
Printed by GEORGE BARCLAY, Castle St. Leicester Sq.

TO

THE CLERGY

OF

THE SEVERAL DEANERIES IN THE DIOCESE OF WINCHESTER,

This Charge,

PRINTED AT THEIR REQUEST,

IS AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED

BY

THEIR FAITHFUL FRIEND AND SERVANT,

C. R. WINTON.

Farnham Castle, Oct. 1858.

BX5034
R53

A CHARGE,

&c.

My Reverend Brethren,

If, on former occasions of meeting you at a season of visitation, my first train of thought was connected with recollections of the past, the recurrence of another periodical gathering, after the lapse of another cycle of years, will give birth to reflections of a kindred character with yet more of vividness. The reminiscences of days that are gone by for ever are always solemn, sometimes affecting. Some one departed who will never return, something done which never can be done again, acquires a sacred place in memory. Passages in our life's history, of no moment in themselves,—the ordinary routine of daily occupation, casual conversation, change of places or of persons, unheeded at the time, and fraught with little interest,—assume an importance in the retrospect quite disproportionate to their original shape and pressure. And if this be

M367519

true in regard to things immaterial and indifferent, how much truer is it in respect of things of highest concern!

Let me connect this thought with the circumstances under which we assemble to-day. Since the time when I first entered upon the episcopal charge of this diocese, more than a quarter of a century ago, how many revolutions of the wheel of life our little world has witnessed! Within that period a generation of pastors has been absorbed into eternity, men looked up to in their day, each the centre of a circle of his own,—some, perhaps, the leaders of a little following. They and the flocks they fed are all alike awaiting the sound of the trumpet which shall summon them to stand before the Shepherd and Bishop of souls. I look around in vain for faces once familiar in their accustomed spheres of duty. Their books are closed for ever, and their candlestick is removed out of its place. I listen in vain for a friendly greeting from well-known voices. The pitcher is broken at the fountain, and the pastoral staff has descended to other hands, and he who held it has gone to his long home in the grave, whence he shall rise up no more until the great day. What the poet sang in his lament over a single village is well-nigh realised in all:—

"'Tis now become a history little known
That once we call'd the parsonage-house our own."

Fewer than fifty remain at this day, throughout the whole diocese, whom I found in their parishes at my primary visit. One out of every twelve, the small surviving remainder, stands like a connecting link between the past and present, embodying the traditions of a defunct age, whose number is reduced successively from year to year, till soon not a parish will be left where men will remember Joseph, save by the tablet in his chancel or the brass upon the pavement, which records, for the instruction of some future antiquary, the first and the last day of his fleeting pastorate.

Yet, let us hope this is not their only memorial. The Apostle speaks of his crowns of rejoicing, and the seals of his ministry. They survived after the time of his departure had arrived and he was taken from them. And so of every faithful minister in Christ's Church. When the grave cries Give, give! and the mourners go about the streets, there will be the spiritual children to perpetuate the name of their spiritual fathers, and hand down their memory in a record less perishable than the most enduring monument, to latest generations.

But the lapse of time brings other changes than that of persons. We can figure to our-

selves some sleeper who, a century ago, had fallen into a deep trance, and, after his hundred years of slumber, suddenly opened his eyes again to the light of day, and awoke to consciousness in the middle of the nineteenth century. We can imagine his bewilderment. The earth would seem to him a new creation, tenanted by a race of beings very dissimilar to those with whom he had been wont to associate —tillage and produce, and gardens of Paradise, a smiling and a fertile land, instead of the waste and wilderness—tens of thousands where he had known hundreds, populous cities where once stood the insignificant village hamlet—men jostling one another along the crowded thoroughfare of life with all that quickened movement of mind and intellect which characterises a country in its palmy state of highest civilisation. He would stand amazed at the developments of scientific research, the marvels of steam power, the facilities of intercommunication,—north calling to south and east to west —a host of mighty forces at work, with a power of expansion to which no limits can be assigned, and fraught with results of which none can fathom the extent: Look where he will, he sees the mind in action—agriculture, manufactures, machinery, commerce, traffic and transit, in every direction; all departments of in-

dustrial life exhibiting unmistakeable signs of an age of gigantic enterprise and of activity without a parallel.

Now it cannot be dissembled that, in this phase of the world's history, our duties, my Reverend Brethren, have undergone material changes. No man can stand still in the eddy of a whirlpool, or be quiescent and stationary while all around him is in movement. As well might he strive to stem the tide of the Atlantic in the fierce surging of its waters, or wrap his cloak around him and make way against the storm and tempest which rend the mountains in their fury. And hence arises the question, whether the machinery of our Church is able to bear the strain upon it. Is it sufficiently elastic to expand to the extent required? Can it sustain the pressure? Can it be made applicable to the wants of a population which has doubled itself since the beginning of this century, and which the man of an hundred years may live to see quadrupled in the interval between his birth and death? Can it rise to the adequate discharge of its duties in the correction of those novel forms of error, and the propagation of those new developments of truth, which the actual condition of the country may demand? Is there within itself such an element of vitality as can survive the deadening influences which

depress the overweighted and overtaxed minister whose flock is counted by myriads of souls? Has he means within his reach which can be made available for compassing the ends for which our parochial institutions were originally designed?

To such questions it is, or used to be, common to receive a negative reply. The inflexibility of the Medes and Persians, and the pride of purple and fine linen, were as household words in their application to the framework and the Clergy of our Church. Imputations of a dignity which knew not how to stoop, of rules without pliancy, of a system without the power of expansion, and of metes and boundaries which admitted neither of contraction nor enlargement, were the staple arguments addressed to the multitude from many quarters, and received as truths by not a few who were not of the multitude. And it must be admitted in candour, and to our shame, that the deep slumber into which the Church of the eighteenth century had sunk gave a colour and currency to these charges, which all the vitality and self-devotion of a succeeding age have hardly sufficed to counteract.

In looking back, however, to the origin of our parishes, it will appear that the very theory of their institution was based upon the principle

of a division of labour within the compass of individual exertion. Whether the ancient parochial divisions were conterminous with those existing for the purposes of pagan worship, or were arbitrary portions of land, partitioned off by the owners, on the introduction of Christianity among the Anglo-Saxons, as the size of their estates or the wants of their dependants required, the number and extent of the parishes were regulated by the circumstances of the neighbourhood, and their limits were wide or narrow in proportion to the amount of population concentrated within a given space. A parish was nothing more than that portion of a territory of which the inhabitants could be accommodated within its single place of worship, and its spiritual wants supplied by the ministrations of the single priest. And if needful, supplemental means were at hand, and were not withheld. As the monastic institutions arose and became more widely developed, they furnished a body of itinerant labourers for missionary work in their respective neighbourhoods, who, without restriction to any definite territorial limits, were recognised and authorised instructors, where and when their services were required. And further, in course of time, as population increased, and families were scattered at a distance from the original centre, or con-

densed around a certain point at the confines of the estate or parish, a second place of worship was erected for their accommodation, and many of those chapelries were formed which exist at the present day, annexed to the mother church, and have become, in many instances, superior in importance and magnitude to the cluster of habitations to which they were originally affiliated.

Elasticity of expansion, therefore, is not inconsistent with the theory of the Church of England, and the primary construction of its machinery. What advantage has been taken of this liberty? It is so much easier to run in the groove than to get out of the beaten track, that some grasp of mind and fixity of determination must be possessed by those who are not content to follow to-day the course pursued yesterday, if they perceive it will fail to lead them to the desired goal. To what extent, then, has the life of the Church prevailed, so as to overcome the inertness of routine, and the benumbing fetters of immemorial usage? A glance at the past, without going further back than the present recollections of living men, will be the best answer to the inquiry.

It is now more than forty years since the first warning voice was raised which attracted public attention to the means for increasing the

efficiency of the Church of England. Two publications by the Rev. Dr. Yates, entitled, "The Church in Danger," and "The Basis of National Welfare," had the merit of leading the way, and were speedily followed by practical results in Parliamentary grants to the amount of 1,600,000*l.*, and in the successive Acts for promoting the building of additional churches in populous parishes. These Acts have been much blamed for complexity and inconsistency—I think, in many respects unjustly. They are no favourites with lawyers, and troublesome to consult, because they involve the necessity of careful and close comparison, in order to ascertain the specific provisions applicable to the particular case. But a practical experience of the working of these Acts for many years enables me to testify that they are invaluable to church builders, in smoothing the difficulties inseparable from their undertaking. The multitude and variety of their provisions form a material element in their usefulness. In building churches, at every step taken some interest is affected, or supposed to be affected, and if the Legislature had required all to have been constituted according to one rule, without modification of circumstances as to patronage, district, endowment, offices, or other incidents, not one half of the actual number would have

been erected. As cases multiplied, new clauses were framed to meet their specialties, and a church builder now will rarely be at a loss to find provisions suitable to his own peculiar requirements, whatever they may be. Had there been no complication, his choice would have been limited to the bed of Procrustes. And as to the inconsistencies, there is much exaggeration; where they exist—and they do exist—they have arisen chiefly from that fruitful source of ambiguity in modern legislation, the introduction of words or clauses in the passage of the bill through its various stages in Parliament, without sufficient attention to their effect upon the wording of other parts of the various Acts.

The first of these Acts was passed in the 58th year of George III. (30th May, 1818), and in the same year were laid the foundations of the Society incorporated by the 9th Geo. IV. c. 42, for promoting the enlargement, building, and repairing of churches and chapels. This association has borne abundant fruit. Up to March 31, 1857, it had received 5106 applications for aid. Grants have been made towards the erection of 1092 additional churches, and the rebuilding or increase of accommodation in 2684 old churches, to the extent of upwards of a million (1,005,871) additional sittings, of which three-fourths (775,673) are free. The

cost of these churches exceeded 4,100,000*l.* (4,132,988*l.*), of which the London Society contributed 547,441*l.* The impulse given extended to every part of the country. Mr. Cotton states in his evidence given before the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Spiritual Destitution, in the last session of Parliament, that since 1801 the work of church building has gone on increasing rapidly every year—3150 churches have been built, at a cost of nearly 11,000,000*l.*, raised by voluntary subscription, for the most part.*

By the side of these large figures, the statistics of a kindred diocesan association may sound as insignificant. But I record with thankfulness, that since the formation of the Winchester Society for promoting the increase of church accommodation, it has aided in building or enlarging 166 churches in Hants and Surrey, with additional sittings for 51,458, at a cost of 278,296*l.*, of which 33,493*l.* were granted from the funds of the Society. A sum of nearly the same amount, as a special fund for Southwark, has been raised, and advantageously expended in promoting the building of churches and schools in the suburban districts. In Hampshire, within the last thirty years, 72 additional churches have been built, and 54

* Appendix to Report, qn. 141.

rebuilt; and in Surrey, 83 built and 31 rebuilt: total, 240 new churches. During the same time 163 have been enlarged in Hants, and 121 in Surrey: total, 284. The expenditure in building and improving has been 483,474*l.* in Hants, and 820,999*l.* in Surrey: total, 1,304,473*l.* The accommodation provided is 155,287 sittings in Hants, and 162,156 in Surrey: total, 317,443, for a population at the last census, but greatly increased since in the neighbourhood of London, of 1,082,621, being at the rate of scarcely 1 in $3\frac{1}{2}$. For the three objects of churches, schools, and parsonages, more than 65,000*l.* have been expended annually in the diocese during the last twenty-five years.

The details I have given may be taken as proofs that the members of the Church have shown no unwillingness to make provision for their own wants, without laying any burthen on those who dissent from her communion. Yet, simultaneously with these efforts of voluntaryism, the agitation for the abolition of Church-rates has become increasingly active. And there is no doubt that the very erection of these new churches has contributed not a little to swell the cry, and has raised a class of objectors within the Church, not less formidable than those without. With many of the latter, the real, though not the avowed object,

is the great question of the separation of the Church from the State, and its reduction to the level of one of the sects of the land. Many join the attack on other grounds, as on the plea of conscience, and the like, but its origin is to be found in reality in hostility to the Established Church, an institution said to be out of keeping with all our other institutions, and the greatest anomaly of the age.* But the former class of objectors, members of our own Church, have a substantial grievance of their own, apart from all political or sectional considerations. They are living in a district chapelry, and find themselves rated, in common with the whole parish, for the maintenance of the mother-church, while they are required at the same time to defray, without assistance from the very rates to which they have contributed, the expenses of their own. And in the north of England especially, where the parishes are of large acreage, it is mainly owing to this cause that Church-rates have ceased to be collected. It appeared, however, by the last Parliamentary return, that of the 12,000 parishes of England, there were scarcely five per cent in which organization against Church-rates prevailed. In this diocese 16 only are

* Extract from "Nonconformist," in the "Liberator," Jan. 1857.

returned as having refused the rate, 8 in each county. There are doubtless many more, where the parishioners have paid with reluctance and remonstrance, or where funds have been provided from other sources, or collections deferred under the expectation of Parliamentary interference. The question has been too fiercely agitated to be disposed of without an authoritative settlement, and in point of fact the Government are understood to have intimated their intention of introducing a measure in the next session. That measure, to be satisfactory and safe, ought, in my judgment, to be founded in principle on the basis of the present law, whatever be the modifications and exceptions which accompany it. Meanwhile I gladly avail myself of this opportunity to express my acknowledgments to the churchwardens generally, who, in the great majority of cases, have discharged their difficult and embarrassing duties with a zeal and judgment which deservedly entitle them to the thanks of the diocese.

These summary details, while they furnish information, interesting, as I hope, to the members of the diocese, as to the provision made for public worship within it, may be taken as evidences of progress in regard to our church edifices generally. Other proofs of the spirit which has been at work in adapting our eccle-

siastical system to the wants of the times, present themselves on every side. It may be worth while to glance at them in connexion with a Petition to both Houses of Parliament, largely signed by clergy and lay members of the Church in the beginning of 1833. The petitioners, after thankfully acknowledging the blessings, temporal and spiritual, which the Church of this realm had been the instrument in the hands of God of communicating to the people, since the period of the Reformation, set forth their desire that all abuses and imperfections should be removed which impeded its usefulness, and its machinery adapted to the exigencies of a greatly increased population. They then suggested the importance of amending the law in various respects. Their principal recommendations are the following:—An appropriate course of professional study for candidates for holy orders—abolition of pluralities, of exemptions from residence, and of sinecures—augmentation of poor benefices—commutation of tithes—division of parishes—additional curates—the licensing of places for public worship in populous districts—improved arrangement of churches for the accommodation of the poor—revision of the boundaries of dioceses—adjustment of church revenues—

extension of the ordinances of the Church to all the foreign dependencies of the empire.*

These recommendations were coldly received at first, and regarded by the majority with suspicion and dislike, if not with positive hostility. They were characterised by many as the wild innovations of extravagant men, who were pulling down the Church. Not a few made it a matter of conscience to touch nothing which had been consecrated by the use of their forefathers, and had sufficed for their edification. Each stone on which a sacrilegious hand was proposed to be laid, was the keystone of the arch, which once removed, the whole building would totter to its fall. Some, more far-

* In no department of church extension has progress been more remarkable of late years than in the provision made for the spiritual instruction of the population in our foreign possessions. The first colonial see, that of Nova Scotia, was erected in 1787, followed by that of Quebec in 1793, and after long intervals, by that of Calcutta, in 1814, and two West Indian bishoprics in 1824. To these five many others have since been added, and latterly in rapid succession, so that at the present time the table of colonial bishoprics comprises a list of not fewer than thirty-four in number. Others are in contemplation, some in progress; and a munificent individual, to whom the Church at home and abroad has been already indebted to an unexampled extent, is understood to have devoted a sum of 15,000*l.* to the erection of a see in the latest of our colonial dependencies, New Columbia.

sighted, who gave countenance and support to the measures of improvement, found themselves in an unpopular minority, and were ostracised in influential quarters.

How stands the case at present, after the lapse of no more than a quarter of a century, as to each of these heads of reform? Let me briefly advert to some of them.

The better preparation of candidates for holy orders stands in the front rank of the recommended measures, and to a certain extent provision has been made for giving effect to the wishes of the petitioners. Systematic theological teaching has been promoted. Initiation into pastoral duties, in the many ways in which a layman can work, has been advantageously practised. Cambridge has established her Voluntary Theological Examination, rendered compulsory by the requisition of nearly all the bishops. Oxford has created her Professors of Pastoral Theology and Ecclesiastical History, to whom the late Dean Ireland added an useful coadjutor by the foundation of an Exegetical Professorship. Durham and Dublin have their divinity students, who, having obtained their testimonium after completion of the course of study, are certificated as Licentiates in Theology. At King's College, London, at St. Aidan's, Birkenhead, at Birmingham, divinity schools

have been founded, where non-graduates are successfully trained for the work of the ministry. Here and there Diocesan Colleges have been provided, an example which doubtless would have been followed more generally, if countervailing disadvantages, inseparable from sectional education for the ministerial office, had not indisposed the public mind to look with favour on the policy of these institutions. It is the characteristic merit of an University that its teaching is affected by the peculiarities of no particular school. If the individual colleges have their idiosyncracies, the harm is counteracted by their mutual relation to the general body,—the common centre round which all revolve, and where they lose their shibboleths, if they have any. The eclectic institution, on the contrary, wears the colours of its single presiding head, sees with his eye, listens with his ear, speaks with his voice, walks with his gait, and in the very path in which he himself has trodden. Under such exclusive influence independent opinion has scarcely power to act, the character is moulded after one uniform type, and the mind of the student, like the habit he wears, is shaped into a distinctive cut and fashion.

Preparation, however, of a healthy and efficient character, is indispensably necessary—

more preparation than the generality of candidates for holy orders yet exhibit. I earnestly ask such of you, my Reverend Brethren, as are incumbents, to reflect how much depends on you in this matter—on you, much more than on the Bishops. I hear it said, "The Bishop ought to raise the standard—he should require higher qualifications—he should reject more sternly." But the Bishop can only take the candidates as they are presented to him: they are not his choice—he has rarely ever been consulted as to their fitness; and he and his chaplains can do no more than fix a minimum of qualifications, of indispensable attainment before imposition of hands can be granted. And then, as in cases of frequent occurrence, if few come up to the level of his wishes, the parishes can scarcely be left altogether destitute, because the best provision for their wants is not at hand,—the pastor, overburthened or sick, or aged, cannot be disappointed altogether of the staff on which he hoped to lean, because it is not of the choicest materials; a staff of reed, instead of the staff of David or Elisha.

The aggravation or the alleviation of the Bishop's load in the discharge of this part of his duty, which Archbishop Leighton felt so onerous that he assigns it as one of the reasons

which led to the resignation of his see,* rests materially on yourselves. It often amazes me to find, in my conversations with candidates, how little they who offer them have inquired into their previous habits or studies; how unaware they are of their actual degree of preparation; how tolerant of a low calibre of mind, giving no promise of a ministry likely to come up to the apostolical standard,—a ministry which none may despise; how satisfied to rest contented if they find their future helpers in possession of those purely formal qualifications which are no evidence of a heart for the work, or, where the heart is not wanting, of gifts essential to the efficient discharge of pastoral functions. There is no part of a Bishop's duty more painful than that of rejecting a candidate for holy orders, of whose devout spirit and pious life he entertains no doubt, but in whom he finds none of that power of mind and aptitude to teach which are indispensable qualifications for duly executing the work of the ministry according to the exigencies of the times. What wonder, if the gap be thus patched up with dead wood, that soon the fence is broken down, and the sheep are scattered! Meanwhile, the trained school-

* Pearson's "Life of Archbishop Leighton," prefixed to the "Commentary on St. Peter," vol. i. p. 115.

master treads upon the heels of the unskilled neophyte, and first-class certificates, and pupil-teachers, and aspirants for the honours of competitive examination, put to shame the scanty store of biblical reading and the stammering tongue of him whose lips ought to keep knowledge.

Even under circumstances the most favourable, weak and inadequate is the best influence which can be brought to bear on candidates for holy orders at the season of ordination itself. The words of one of the Bishops of our Church often occur to my mind at those periods. He speaks of his aim to make them apprehend both what belongs to a spiritual life and to the pastoral care; and then he adds,—"On these subjects I spoke much and often to every one of them apart. . . . . This was all that I could do: but, alas, how defective is this!"*

There is one thought which brings comfort under these considerations, and we may thankfully take refuge in it. He who has promised to be with His ministering servants alway, is able to mould all their hearts according to His will, and to preserve in integrity and freedom from error the eternal truths committed to the keeping even of these earthen vessels.

* Burnet's "History of his own Times." The Conclusion, vol. ii. p. 643.

While the petitioners ask for a higher standard of preparation for the ministerial office, they are silent on the subject of general education. Not that in 1833 there was no need of improvement—that schools were universal, scholars in fair proportion to the population, teachers competent for their work, or the staple of instruction satisfactory. Progress, however, had even then begun. Parliamentary returns in 1818 gave a total of 19,230 day-schools in England, and 674,883 scholars,—or, 1 in 17·25 of the population. In 1833 the day-schools had increased to 38,971, and the scholars to 1,276,947,—being in the proportion of 1 in 11·27 of the population, and an increase of 89 per cent on the numbers in 1818. In the same year a grant of 20,000*l.* was contributed by the Government; and the like sum was annually voted till 1839, when the Committee of Council on Education was formed. A vast stimulus was immediately applied to the various agencies engaged in the work of education; training-schools were established in town and country; and in 1846, the minutes which now form the basis of government aid were framed, the certificate and pupil-teacher systems were set in action, and grants were annually voted, increasing from 30,000*l.* in 1839, to more than 600,000*l.* in the present year. The

results may be described summarily in the words of Mr. Horace Mann, writing in 1854:—

"The records and the recollections which describe society so recently as fifty years ago, bear testimony to a state of ignorance and immorality so dense and general, that if any member of the present generation could be suddenly transported to that earlier period, he would probably be scarcely able, notwithstanding many abiding landmarks, to believe himself in England, and would certainly regard the change which half-a-century has witnessed in the manners of the people as but little short of the miraculous. Comparison is scarcely possible between the groups of gambling, swearing children—no unfavourable example of young England then—whom Raikes of Gloucester, in 1781, with difficulty collected in the first Sunday-school, and any single class of the 2,400,000 scholars who now gather with alacrity, and even with affection, around their 318,000 teachers."*

In this diocese the work has proceeded with steady advances. In 1829, 30,461 children were returned as under education in day and Sunday-schools connected with the Church. In 1851 the numbers had more than tripled, being 103,769. There are now more day-

* "Education Census Report," p. xv.

schools (89 of all denominations) in the single union of Winchester than there were in the whole county (83) a century and a quarter ago. The schools in Lambeth are 6 times as many (297 of all denominations) as in all Surrey (48) at the same time. The proportion per cent of scholars to population in Church schools is 6·87 in Hants, and 4·53 in Surrey.

These figures have a satisfactory sound; but it is far more important to ascertain the character of the schools than their number. Have the trained teachers of both sexes, who have been sent forth from the diocesan training schools of Winchester and Salisbury, common to the two dioceses, raised the standard — I will not say to the point desired, but to any noticeable degree of improvement? Have certificated masters and mistresses, and pupil-teachers, repaid, in the ability and success of their services, the pains and cost expended on their preparation? I have sought answers to these inquiries from the Inspectors, and it will be useful to give some of the results I have gleaned.

In Surrey, Mr. Brookfield speaks favourably of the relative merits of its schools, as not surpassed by other portions of the kingdom. Of the 332 schools inspected in 1857 in his district (including with Surrey, Sussex, Kent,

and the Channel Islands), the classification stands thus :— 75 good, an increase on former years ; 119 fair ; 138 moderate, including some of a lower type. Among the noticeable features which characterise them, Mr. Brookfield enumerates a prevailing spirit of kindness and parental consideration, and an absence of harshness and uncontrolled temper on the part of the teachers, and of crouching looks and sense of irksomeness among the children, which used to be so common. " And," he adds, " of the moral character of the schools generally, or of their teachers, it would be difficult to speak in terms too favourable." The defects, on the other hand, lie principally within the region of method and management. He apologises for being a faultfinder, but needlessly. It is the most important part of his office, and the faults themselves deserve the careful attention of the teacher and the clergyman. He specifies the following :— Schools, good five years ago, are not making advance upon what they had then achieved ; reading deficient in articulation and expression ; answers inaudible ; rudiments taken for granted as familiar, though in fact unknown ; arithmetic taught by abstract and conventional rules, rather than by bills of parcels, and devices derived from actual life ; limitation of attention to the clever and in-

dustrious, to the neglect of the dull and indolent of the class.

For Hampshire I have derived valuable information from Mr. Jones, the late Inspector under the Diocesan Board of Education, and from the Rev. Mr. Warburton, Government Inspector in that county.

Mr. Jones, during 1857, visited 185 schools, conducted by 210 principal teachers. Of these, 66 were trained and certificated; 40 trained, but not certificated; 5 certificated, but not trained; and 99 neither trained nor certificated —a number which I hope to see decreasing year by year. He reports the average age to which children remain at school to be on the decrease,* which is not a favourable symptom of the efficiency of the schools. Parents, even of the poorest and most ignorant class, will often sacrifice something of their children's earnings if they find them improving under attendance. They are not incompetent judges of their progress, though themselves, as they say, no scholars. Of the 228 schools visited in 1856, 163 were revisited in 1857, and of this number 72 had improved, with a considerable increase in the average attendance— a fact which may be taken in corroboration of the

* In 1856 it was 10·8; in 1857, 10·1: showing a decrease of ·7.

remark just made; 8 had retrograded, 4 of them from change of teachers, and 83 remained stationary. The demand for juvenile labour is on the increase, a circumstance giving additional value to the night-schools. In 60 of the parishes visited these schools were in operation, with 1742 registered pupils, and an average attendance of 1255. Secular instruction, for the most part, is all that is given in them; but they are invaluable in maintaining a healthy influence, and in leading to the Sunday-school.

Mr. Warburton expresses surprise that although H. M. Inspectors always visit a new school as soon as invited, and the capitation grant is paid for the twelvemonth preceding the first visit, without requiring the certification of the teacher, in all cases where the registers have been kept, and the school exhibits any signs of vitality, yet no more than 132 schools in the 390 parishes within his district are in connexion with the Committee of Council. It is to the small country schools that Government assistance is commonly found not to extend, though, independently of the probability of their obtaining the capitation grant, they would derive benefit, direct or indirect, in almost every case, from the Inspector's visit. Doubtless this is owing, in a great degree, to the

difficulty of providing funds adequate for the payment of certificated teachers, as the minimum salaries at which they are procurable are generally beyond the reach of the managers in small parishes. A minute of council, which shall make some provision for aiding schools of this class—the most in need of any—would be a great boon.* Sometimes, however, disinclination to connect the school with the Committee of Council arises from an undefined dread of an intermeddling from without with the management—an apprehension which, as far as my experience goes, may be dismissed altogether. Not a single instance of such interference has occurred, to my knowledge, within my diocese. Sometimes, too, there is a shrinking from the publicity of the tabulated reports; but these, wisely or unwisely, are now suppressed, as far as the public is concerned, and supplied in manuscript only to the parochial clergyman, and the visit of the Inspector now differs little from that of a private friend. The zeal and devotion of clergy and teachers are of unexampled amount, but the same sacrifices and the same exertions might be made to tell more on results. Many are the schools in which the teachers are working up to their utmost strength, often beyond it, and the parochial clergyman is

* See Appendix A.

himself labouring like a second teacher ; and yet their toils are frustrated by the irregularity of the organisation and want of proper appliances for teaching. The remedy, my Reverend Brethren, in many cases, is in your own hands. I can but indicate and recommend it. Connexion with the Committee of Council would provide a cure for both these defects ; it would furnish method and money,—assistances which can be supplied at present from no other quarter.

I give the conclusion of Mr. Warburton's communication entire, and in his own words.

"However reluctantly one would believe that the majority of our female teachers are defective in the power of organization, which is at the bottom of all good school-keeping, I am afraid it must be admitted that such is the case. There are some few excellent infant-schools in Hants ; but though I could point to no less than 8 or 10 first-class boys' schools, I do not know of one girls' school worthy to stand in the foremost rank. There are several schoolmasters employed in this county, who are quite worthy to stand at the head of their profession. I do not mean in amount of personal and intellectual gifts or acquirements, though in this respect they rank as high as any, but rather on account of their professional qualifications. Without

instituting invidious comparisons, I am inclined to think that few other parts of the country are so well off in this respect, and that the cause of education in the county generally is enjoying a large measure of the Divine blessing, and making satisfactory progress. The general level is rising, though there are here and there discouraging circumstances to be encountered; and among these, perhaps the principal is the early removal of the children from school, owing to the gross indifference of parents. Not long since the cry was for schools, now it is for scholars to put in them. Within the schools themselves, one observes pretty generally unmistakeable symptoms that the new system of instruction, of which the aim is, not so much to impart information as to awaken the intelligence and cultivate the moral nature of the children, is beginning to tell in the ability to grapple with simple questions put in unfamiliar forms, in the clearness and definiteness of their conceptions, in more cheerful obedience, and greater candour, honesty, and love of work."

In regard to Sunday-schools, I can add nothing in the way of enforcement to the remarks I offered on the last occasion of addressing you. Those remarks, it will be remembered, led to an active movement throughout the whole county of Hants, where the Archdeacon, with his

wonted energy, seconded by able and zealous coadjutors, presided personally at more than sixty conferences of clergy and laity, church-wardens, teachers, pupil-teachers, and others interested in the welfare of the parishes, in every part of the county. These meetings were reported as likely to lead to hopeful results; and I would now put the question to each — What have you done in your own sphere? What step in advance have you gained for your own Sunday-school? What voluntary teachers have you added to it? What number of children, who have left the daily school, have continued their attendance on Sunday instruction? I must add emphatically, that I regard this class of schools with unabated interest—with growing convictions, if that were possible, of their importance, and with a yet more earnest desire for their increased efficiency.

The prayer of the petitioners of 1833 in regard to pluralities has been effectually answered by successive acts of the legislature. No second living can now be held in conjunction with another, unless one is under the annual value of 100*l.*, and the two churches are within three miles of each other. The effect of the present stringent limitations may be tested by the operation of the law in this diocese. In 1831, previously to the passing of the first

restriction Act, there were 122 pluralities. Twenty years later the number was reduced to 41, being a diminution of two-thirds. At the present time, one half of this reduced number has disappeared. Of the 21 pluralists yet remaining, five only would be permitted under the present law; and in no instance would such permission be injurious, or, indeed, otherwise than necessary, if the duties of the small and insufficiently endowed second living are to be discharged at all. The average population of the 10 parishes is 335, and the average income of the 5 incumbents 175*l.*, with 3 parsonages on the 10 livings. None will say that these are inordinate emoluments, or populations too large for individual ministerial superintendence.

Exemption from residence is disallowed altogether, except temporarily, during illness, and, in the case of chaplains and others, during their discharge of actual duty. Of sinecures, those alone remain which are in lay patronage —few in number, and year by year in process of gradual absorption.

I come next to the petition for augmentation of poor benefices. This has been provided from two sources, independently of the annual grants made by the Governors of Queen Anne's bounty. First,—under the operation of an Act passed in 1 and 2 William IV. c. 45, enabling

ecclesiastical persons to augment small livings to the amount of 300*l.* per annum, of which many corporations, sole and aggregate, have availed themselves to a considerable extent; secondly, and chiefly,—out of the Common Fund at the disposal of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England. From the latter source, a larger amount of relief has accrued to the poorer benefices than is generally understood—inadequate, indeed, in comparison with their wants, but an instalment of good, adding materially to the comforts of many a parsonage, and now advancing rapidly in annual increase, as the revenues under the control of the Commissioners are gradually developed. The total number of benefices thus permanently augmented, exclusive of districts formed under the New Parishes Acts, amounted, on the 1st of November, 1857, to 882, with an aggregate population of 2,392,326; and the grants made by the Commissioners in respect of these benefices, exclusive of the value of land and tithe-rent charge, annexed in certain cases, amount to the annual sum of 46,833*l.* In addition, the Commissioners, up to the same date, had constituted, under the New Parishes Acts, 254 districts, with an aggregate population of 875,941. The annual payments in respect of these districts amount to 35,137*l.*, making a total permanent

charge on the Common Fund, for augmentation and endowment of parochial cures, of 81,970*l.* per annum. The Common Fund is further charged with an annual payment of 18,000*l.*, due to the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, as interest upon the loan of 600,000*l.* stock, borrowed in 1843 for the purpose of forthwith constituting, under Sir Robert Peel's Act, 200 districts, with an endowment of 150*l.* per annum each.* Large sums have been also paid by the Commissioners for building and aiding in building parsonage-houses in many parishes.

During the last two years the available surplus has been such as to justify the resumption of grants so long suspended from want of means; and capital sums of 5000*l.* and 18,000*l.* respectively, in addition to the amount before mentioned, have been appropriated towards making better provision for the cure of souls. To meet the first sum of 5000*l.*, benefactions from private contributors to the amount of 7000*l.* were offered and accepted; and a proportionate amount has been obtained to meet the larger sum set apart for distribution in the present year.

The annual revenue thus appropriated represents a capital of many millions, devoted exclusively and in perpetuity to the use of the

* "Tenth General Report of Eccles. Comm." pp. 5, 6.

parochial clergy. Yet it would be a great mistake to infer that the number of poor benefices has decreased, or to expect that decrease is likely soon to occur. Paragraphs meet the eye continually, enumerating the hundreds of livings with incomes below a given sum, and every neighbourhood affords examples, notorious and undeniable, to verify the fact. The reason is obvious. Where one church is augmented, three are built, for the most part with endowments so insufficient, as to stand in need of increase. So that, if additions have been made to the income of 1100 or 1200 clergy within the last fifteen years, the clergy of 3000 new churches have arisen, within little more than the same period of time, to fill the vacuum, and claim in turn the aid of the Commissioners.

That inadequate parochial endowments are a great evil, seriously detrimental to the usefulness of the Church, none will deny, and least of all the Bishop, who has means of knowing beyond all others the privations suffered by the pastor, and the grievous hindrances to his ministry, in an ill-endowed cure of souls. A witness of great experience gives in evidence before the Committee on Spiritual Destitution, that "the smallness of the income of the clergy greatly interferes with their ministerial usefulness,"—"it diminishes their influence over the

people, and impairs their energies in their work." Another states — "My clerical income is so wretched that I am not able to devote my whole time, as I ought to do, to my church and district. My endowment is only 80*l*., and being a family man, I am obliged to educate my own children myself." *

But the truth is, that the choice lies between two evils. The alternative is a poor clergyman or a heathen population,—ill-endowed churches, or none. Private liberality has been exhibited in an unexampled degree, and in no part of the country to a greater extent or with more readiness than in my own diocese; but no available resources are sufficient to compete with the wants of a population which has doubled itself within the memory of living man. Take the case of the London district alone, a portion of which is included in my own diocese. "Since the census of 1851, the population has increased by 254,608 souls, and it is now increasing at the rate of 60,000 souls annually, requiring the erection and endowment of fifteen additional churches every year, to keep pace with the population." † "Wait to lay the foundations of your fifteen churches," say many, "till competent incomes have been provided for the future ministers."

* Appendix to Report, qn. 102, 103, 5838.

† Qn. 1306, 1307.

And these objectors have much to say in defence of their position. On principles of political economy they are unassailable. For my own part, however, I must frankly confess I cannot consent to leave the 60,000 souls in the heathenism of neglect, destitute of means of grace and instruction, because I have no other means of ministering to their wants than by creating an additional number of what are somewhat invidiously termed pauper benefices.* If the choice lies, as I fear must be admitted, between no pastor at all, none to care for the 60,000 souls, and the man of smallest means, "by poverty depressed," with all the drawbacks of Lenten fare throughout the year, and the anxieties inseparable from a straitened income, I hope it will not be attributed to any want of sympathy on my part with such a lot, or to insensibility for its privations, if I can entertain no doubt which alternative to prefer. Men are not wanting who will stand in the gap, and enter devotedly into these ungrateful fields of labour, as they are sometimes deemed, with all their disadvantages. Take the portrait of one of this class, of whom the world is not worthy.

"I spent a day at the house of the clergyman of that district, and I have no hesitation in saying that the circumstances in which he

* Appendix G. to Report, p. 592.

lives are inferior, in point of comfort, to those of most schoolmasters certificated under the Government. His house is of the poorest description. He lives in the midst of his population; he has none of the ordinary comforts and luxuries of life which are generally considered to be due to a person in his station. I have no hesitation in saying that his ministerial usefulness is impaired by the inadequacy of his income; but I feel bound to say this, that I never met with a man more happy in his work; he did not complain of his position, further than generally to observe that he was not able to do so much among the people as he would be delighted to do, had he the means."* Another witness before the Spiritual Destitution Committee states in evidence that "the earnestness of the clergy in visiting, their self-devotion, working on miserable pittances, and giving themselves up entirely to their work, is beyond all praise." And the Committee, in quoting this testimony in their Report, "deem it their duty to add, that the general tenor of the evidence before them largely confirms this statement."† Men of this stamp are nursing children for God, and He will give them their wages.

Further suggestions in the same Petition

* Appendix, qn. 168. Evidence of the Bishop of Ripon.

† Report, p. vii.

recommend division of extensive parishes,— provision for additional curates,— license of unconsecrated places for Divine worship,— and improved arrangements in parish churches for the better accommodation of both rich and poor. These are measures now so trite and familiar, as scarcely to admit of a passing remark,— a quarter of a century ago they were new and startling, offered with much hesitation and cautious apology by men who felt they were taking a step in advance of their forefathers, whose boldest plea for increased efficiency in the Church was urged on no more venturesome ground than that of zeal without innovation.

Not that these improvements, obvious and necessary as they now seem, were matured without difficulty, or carried into effect with universal acquiescence. To reduce a parish of many miles in extent to an area which can be compassed by ordinary walking powers, or out of 100,000 souls to assign 4000 to the charge of an individual minister, would appear measures reasonable enough to command general approval. But at every step some interest, local or personal, is affected. Some object that the head of the parish will be too much lowered,— his influence impaired. Vestries complain that the parish is cut up into shreds and patches, and that they do not like new-fangled arrangements

and nondescript parishes.* Sometimes conscience, or prejudice, or old associations, or a local Act, or the apportionment of a charity, raises an obstacle. Patronage is to be adjusted, boundaries to be defined,—a very fertile cause of discussion, I might have said of dispute,—rights of property are to be respected, vested interests to be compensated, civil and ecclesiastical liabilities and privileges to be carefully distinguished, before the smallest angle can be cut off from an area, large as a petty kingdom, and a sound parochial system effectually realised.

Whether every subdivision should be complete in itself for all ecclesiastical purposes, with its church and minister in all respects independent of the original parish, is a question on which much diversity of opinion still exists. The evidence before the Spiritual Destitution Committee is conflicting. The Rector of St. George's, Southwark, a man of much experience, thinks that, "generally speaking, the more parochial subdivision can be carried out the better, and thus independent parishes be created; but," he adds, "there are exceptional cases, where it is better to have one individual having a larger area, and many subordinates under him." He instances the example of a very poor division

* Appendix to Report, qn. 2852.

of a parish, where, if constituted into an independent parish, the incumbent has to struggle with great difficulties.* Canon Dale admits that, in theory, it is most desirable that every district with a population of a certain amount, commonly fixed by witnesses at 4000, should have its own minister, with an entire and exclusive property in him, were it not that his income, insufficient for his own support, or for relieving the necessities of the poor, would place him under very disadvantageous circumstances. "My conviction is," he says, "that unless the district contains what I should call the elements of a parish, with a part of the population able to contribute to the necessities of the poor, it would be much better that it should remain dependent upon the parish church, for then not only would it draw upon its funds, but the pastoral care of the people would always be provided for.† Incumbents seem generally to lean to this opinion. The current of my own experience does not run in the same direction. Mr. Rivington, an intelligent and active layman, seems to me to touch the gist of the question. "It is better," he says, "to commit a district to the independent care of a clergyman, where he understands he has the responsibility, as he can work more comfort-

* Appendix, qn. 1991–2019. † Qn. 2790.

ably than if he has a sort of undefined relation to the rector of the parish." * Mr. Rivington, however, lays stress upon an independent income. For myself, I prefer to additional curates district incumbents, even with small endowments, with districts entirely independent of the original parish for ecclesiastical purposes, with exemption from liability to maintain the fabric of any other than the church of the district, and a claim to the performance of all religious rites, with all fees and offerings assigned to its own proper minister. All recent legislation, and especially the New Parishes Acts, have sanctioned these principles, and instances of districts, dependent by any link whatever upon the mother-church, or the incumbent of the undivided civil parish, will soon become exceptional throughout the country.

The rapid increase of population in many parts of this diocese, especially in the suburban districts, and some of our coast towns, and around the railway stations, has given an active impulse to this work of parochial subdivision. In Hants 51 ancient parishes, and in Surrey 34, total 85, being about one-fourth of the whole number of original benefices, have been broken down into cures of more convenient size; and 74

* Qn. 3045.

new districts have been formed in the former county, and 77 in Surrey: total, 151.

After all, however, parochial subdivision is not always practicable, and where practicable, not always sufficient. Who shall say that the clergy connected with 140,000 souls in Lambeth, or with more than 55,000 in St. George's, Southwark, or with 75,000 in Portsea,—in which parishes respectively, 46,000, 12,000, and 15,000, additional sittings are required to provide for that part of the population to which no religious body whatever affords any accommodation for public worship—shall meet their parishioners for religious teaching and common prayer nowhere but within the narrow walls of their consecrated churches? If so restricted, what a mockery would it be to bid them not to forsake the assembling of themselves together? How call upon them to use the Liturgy of our Church, if they are never to meet in common worship? It is matter of thankfulness that our mouths are not so closed, and that our liberty of action has not been fettered by any such suicidal regulations. Yet the time has not long gone by, if indeed it be now passed altogether, when, if a Bishop were himself to exercise, or give license to another to exercise, the functions of his ministry within the walls of an unconsecrated building, not a few would have con-

sidered it a scandal in the Church. A quarter of a century ago, Cottage Lectures were considered as an irregularity; so much so, that in one of my earliest charges I found it necessary to vindicate the free action of the incumbent or curate for exposition of Holy Scripture and prayer with the people in their own houses, each within his own cure.* He is breaking no law, whether he call them to meet him at their own homes or in his school-room, or whether they cluster around him, unbidden and uninvited, in those open-air services now familiar to our ears, which have taken their place in many populous districts, among the stated ministrations of our parochial clergy.

Encouraging details have been given me by a Southwark incumbent of the unabated interest evinced by his hearers—their marked attention even to the close—and the eagerness with which the tracts distributed at these gatherings have been sought after. These meetings have taken place on Sunday and week-day evenings, the attendance varying from 70 to 700, the largest numbers on Sundays. In one instance only had any attempt at disturbance occurred, when an intoxicated Romanist endeavoured, but ineffectually, to interrupt the

* Second Charge, 1833.

preacher. I give the texts of some of the sermons, as specimens of the subjects judiciously chosen for addressing the particular class of persons present on these occasions:—Eph. ii. 20, Jesus Christ the chief corner-stone; Luke xix. 20, The Son of Man seeking to save that which was lost; 2 Cor. v. 17, The new creature in Christ Jesus; Jer. viii. 22, Balm in Gilead; Rom. v. 6, When yet without strength Christ died for us; John x. 3, The sheep hear the voice of the Shepherd; 1 Pet. i. 19, "The precious blood of Christ;" John iii. 14, 15, The serpent in the wilderness; John iii. 16, "God so loved the world, that he gave His only-begotten Son;" Num. xxxv. 11, The cities of refuge; John xii. 32, "I, if I be lifted up," &c.; 1 John i. 9, "If we confess our sins," &c.

Very motley is the assemblage which stands around the preacher on these occasions. There may be seen the stout drayman in his woollen coat, the coalheaver in his sou'wester, the white-coated baker and the red-coated postman, the railway porter and the carman, the tidy labourer in his clean white smock, or Sunday suit of rusty black, and the untidy labourer in his dirty shirt sleeves. What Christian spectator who witnesses these extraordinary scenes will fail to recognise the testimony borne to the messenger of the glad tidings of the Gospel from our Lord's

days downwards,—"The common people heard him gladly?"

Evidence was given before the Spiritual Destitution Committee of the usefulness of these services. One witness stated that, having circulated notice by handbills of his intention to preach in the open air, on a common adjoining the town, a large congregation was collected, chiefly of poor people, many of them weavers, who had not been in the habit of attending the church at all. And he adds, "I believe from that very day there was an increase of at least 200 in the ordinary Sunday congregation."*

The Rector of St. George's, Southwark, whose attendances have varied from 100 to 2000, bears testimony to the peaceable and respectful conduct of the people; so much so, he adds, "that when an effort has been made to disturb us, it has been put down by the people themselves." In answer to a question whether the main advantage of the open-air services is that of drawing the people into the churches, or a thing to rest in itself as an end, he replies, "My principle has always been to go out to bring them in."†

* Appendix, qn. 4161–66.

† Qn. 1101–4. Another witness, who, it will be observed, has not tried the experiment, speaks unfavourably

The services to which I have been referring may be classed under the head of the Home Missionary work of the parochial minister. Measures of a similar tendency, on a larger scale, have been suggested and carried into effect in some instances — all having for their object the extension of the parochial system, and its application to the varied forms of spiritual want, arising among the gatherings of population around some new centre of industry, or in the crowded suburbs of our metropolis and great commercial capitals. Home Missionary Associations have been organised in some dioceses, and clergy sought out with special gifts for influencing such as are estranged from all religious ordinances, and ministering to them as best they may, until, under God's blessing, they have gathered a flock which may be collected in a church. Short services, and plain expositions of the word of God, are also among the ex-

of open-air addresses. "Have you done anything in the way of addressing the people in the open air? Nothing whatever. Do you find persons whom you would meet in the streets, if you preached in the open air, come to your church? Many of them are such. I find it much better to visit them, and talk to them in the school-room. Somebody might preach on the opposite side of the way, and we might have an altercation; or some dissenting preacher might do so in the first instance, and thus produce awkwardness. Do you think there is much use in street-preaching? None whatever."

pedients which have been resorted to, with the same object in view. Such services, the Litany for instance, with or without a sermon, at any hour of the day, have been introduced into many parishes of my diocese, and, as I am informed, with advantage. I am ready to sanction them whenever desired, provided they do not supersede, and are not substituted for, any ordinary service of the Church.

What has been said of Church improvement since the year 1833, will suffice to show that the stakes have been strengthened and the cords lengthened. And will any now call these measures destructive? Will any see in them the elements of spoliation and subversion, the devices of men who are sapping and undermining the foundations of our Zion, under the pretence of building up the wall and reviving the stones out of the heaps of rubbish, and fortifying the bulwarks around the city? Has one step been taken too far in advance? Could a single line of extension have been spared, or ought a single forward movement to have been checked, as going beyond the mark, and in excess of what the exigencies of the times demanded? Were they who asked for the fuller development of the resources of the Church other than her true sons and defenders, the promoters of her utility, and the instruments,

under God, of diffusing more widely the blessings in her charge?

Yet these Reformers knew where to stop. They could discriminate between the improvement of the machinery, and the safe-keeping of the material which the machinery was to work. While they prayed that new channels of usefulness might be opened, they earnestly implored the authorities to guard the invaluable blessing of their Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy. Doubtless they would have extended their prayer to a plea for the safe-keeping of our Authorized Bible, in a version to which use has imparted a sacredness only second to that of inspiration itself, had proposals for revision been as current then as during the last few years. Revision of the sacred text, except for the satisfaction of the learned, and as a help for students of Scripture, in their more minute examination of God's holy word, would lead to dangers from which at present I see no means of escape. Meanwhile specimens of labours in the direction to which I have adverted, conducted in a spirit of just and reverent caution, have already shown that, while our translation is not so free from all flaw or inexactness of rendering as to be altogether "without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing," it is yet an adequate counterpart of the

original, alike for the devout reader and the unlettered Christian man.

Would that this value for our formularies, in the very type in which we have inherited them, were felt universally! The last Session of Parliament witnessed an endeavour in the Upper House to procure a revision of that form of Common Prayer which, for so many centuries, has been the exponent of the devotional feelings of our congregations, in all the joys and sorrows of the soul, under every diversity of circumstance, and in all the phases of life. The attempt met with little support from any quarter of the House,—with none from any member of the Episcopal bench. In common with all of them with whom I have had an opportunity of conversing, without claiming the merit of absolute perfection for our Church Services, I earnestly deprecate any tampering with them, under whatever specious guise the alterations may be recommended. Particular views may advocate change in one direction or another, expressions may be modified to harmonise with this or that shade of opinion, a little more latitude given here, or a little more restriction enforced there; but this at least is certain, that nothing will be omitted which many will not strenuously desire should

be retained, nothing added which a large section would not consider superfluous, or even objectionable—no form of expression, varied ever so cautiously, against which protests would not be entered as involving the dilution of vitally important doctrines, or the admission of dangerous error.

Meanwhile, it is next to impossible but that, under these operations, that broad platform of divine truth would be narrowed, on which Churchmen with permitted differences have been accustomed to stand, from father to child, generation after generation, on common ground, in the unity of brethren. It was well said by one of the Bishops in Convocation, where entire unanimity prevailed in reference to this subject, that "he believed the poor throughout the country received the English Prayer-book with a reverence next to the Bible, and any suggestion to alter it would shock their deep feelings of Christian devotion."

Our formularies, indeed, are a common inheritance, which every member of the Church, lay or clerical, has a mutual interest in preserving sacred and inviolate. They are to him, in regard to his religious belief, what Magna Charta was to the barons as to their political *status*,—the solemn declaration and definition of his Christian liberty. It is with pain I see a tendency

in the minds of many to give a meaning to particular passages at variance with the whole tenor of the doctrine of our Reformed Church, and to cull out from the writings of individual divines of high name opinions sometimes difficult to reconcile, sometimes in direct antagonism to expressions in our liturgical forms and articles. But as nothing is more easy than to exhibit these discrepancies, so is nothing more fallacious. You may prop up any diversity of doctrine by a catena of isolated passages from our soundest theologians, the general tenor of whose writings is notoriously opposed to the particular view they are quoted to support. Words loosely employed, forms of expression which have acquired in lapse of time a certain controversial meaning not originally belonging to them, phrases capable of being interpreted in more than one sense, are often pressed into a service very different from that designed by their authors. There is no such fixity of meaning in the language used in different treatises, and at different times of life, by the same divine, as can make a superficial reader certain that the author is always strictly consistent with himself. But, whether consistent or inconsistent, whether uniformly orthodox with a logical precision, or otherwise, it is not on individual divines, of whatever weight or

wisdom, that we are at liberty to pin our faith. To the definitions and explanations of the framers of our formularies, gathered collectively and expressed authoritatively—not to the detached dogmas of any one of them in particular—we have given our assent, as to the recognised standard of appeal for all the members of our communion. We are pledged, not to the private judgment of the profoundest and the holiest amongst them, but "always so to minister the doctrines and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and realm have received the same."

Take, as a case in point, the Adoration of the Eucharist. Among the most revered of my predecessors in this see, Bishop Andrewes stands prominently forward. In his Answer to Bellarmine the following passage occurs:—"*Imo Christus ipse Sacramenti res, in et cum Sacramento, extra et sine Sacramento, ubi ubi est, adorandus est.*"* "Truly Christ Himself, the *res Sacramenti*, both in and with the Sacrament, out of and without the Sacrament, wheresoever he is, is to be adored." Separate this sentence from the context, and it might seem to be the warrant of one of the fathers of our Church, of highest authority, for the adoration

* "Respons. ad Apol. Bellarm." Angl. Cath. Libr. pp. 266, 267, quoted by Goode on the Eucharist, p. 820.

of the elements, as containing the body of Christ on the table. And in this sense it has been quoted, and passes current with many. But the Church has spoken here, and very differently. "Lest the same kneeling [of communicants] should by any persons, either out of ignorance or infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved, it is hereby declared that no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine, then bodily received, or to any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians."*

Bishop Andrewes, therefore, with all his claims upon our respect, is not to be heard if he speaks at variance with the Church in this matter. But in reality there is no need to fear his antagonism. Archbishop Wake vindicates the true meaning of the disputed passage. "How this Bishop thought Christ truly present in the Sacrament we have seen before, and may from thence easily conclude how he supposed He might be adored there; viz. as in all other holy offices, in which we confess Him by His

* Declaration at the end of the Communion Service.

divine power to be present with us, but especially in this sacred mystery. And thus we all adore Him, both in, and with, and without the Sacrament, — we confess Him to be truly present, and therefore truly to be adored by us."* And any other interpretation would be in contradiction with his doctrine in another treatise, one section of which is against the teaching of "the belief of Christ in the Sacrament *sub speciebus*," and another against "the external adoration of the Sacrament."†

In connexion with this ambiguous and double meaning of passages in our old divines I have referred formerly, and must now refer again, to a phrase used in common parlance, though not in a common sense, by our own Church and that of Rome — the Real Presence in the Eucharist. Abundant quotations of language which might be employed by the Romanists, and taken to mean a bodily presence in their sense of the words, may be produced from the writings even of those of our old divines who are known to have combated most strongly the doctrine in question. And they are cited as evidence that a doctrine, not distinguishable from that which it was one of the main objects of the Reformation to overthrow, and declared in one of the

* Archbishop Wake's "Disc. of the Holy Eucharist."

† "Minor Works," pp. 13, 15.

Articles to be "repugnant to the plain words of Scripture,"* is not inconsistent with the teaching of our Church. And certainly, when Bishop Cosin tells us that "upon the words of consecration the body and blood of Christ is really and substantially present, and so exhibited and given to all that receive it," he seems to speak the very language of the Council of Trent. But then he adds immediately, and in the same sentence, "and all this, not after a physical and sensual, but after an heavenly and incomprehensible manner," which at once reconciles him with the declaration of the Article, that "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner." And if this seems irreconcileable with *substantial* presence, hear him again, speaking of the change in the elements, —"It is a change of state and condition, which alters not the natural properties of the element." The Fathers "understood no change than that which is common to all Sacraments, whereby the outward natural part is said to be changed into the inward and divine, only because it represents it truly and efficaciously, and makes all worthy receivers partakers thereof; and because, by virtue of the Holy Spirit, and of Christ's holy institution, the elements obtain

* Art. xxviii.

those divine excellencies and prerogatives which they cannot have of their own nature. And this it is which was taught and believed for above a thousand years together by pious and learned antiquity concerning this most holy mystery."*

Bradford himself, a martyr for the truth, might be adduced as holding the corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament. "I do believe," says he, "that Christ is corporally present at, and in the due administration of, the Sacrament." But he adds,—"By this word *corporally*, I mean that Christ is present corporally unto faith."†

And so Dean Aldrich,—"If we rightly understand the presence, it is not material with what adverbs we affirm it. We may say, it is *really*, *essentially*, nay, *corporally* present; that is, it is present inasmuch as it is really received, to all intents and purposes, for which the *res ipsa*, the *essence*, the *substance*, the *very body* would be useful to us, if it were physically and locally present; and the difference between us and the Papists is plain."‡

In our own Article the word *spiritual* is

* Cosin's "Hist. of Transubstantiation," ch. vi. s. 7, and s. 1.

† "Acts and Monuments," p. 1608.

‡ "Reply to Two Discourses."

joined with *heavenly*,— "after an heavenly and spiritual manner;" so that the one explains the other, and none can mistake the sense in which the latter word is used. And this caution is not superfluous, as Bishop Jeremy Taylor warns us,—"We say that Christ's body is in the Sacrament really, but spiritually. They, too (the Papists), say it is there really, but spiritually (for so Bellarmine is bold to say that the word [spiritual] may be allowed in this question.) Where now is the difference? Here, by spiritually *they* mean present after the manner of a spirit: by spiritually *we* mean present to our spirits only; that is, so as Christ is not present to any other sense but that of faith or spiritual susception. . . . . They say that Christ's body is truly present there, as it was upon the cross, but not after the manner of any body, but after that manner as an angel is in a place, *i. e.* there spiritually. But we, by "the real spiritual presence of Christ," do understand Christ to be present as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful, by blessing and grace; and this is all that we mean besides the typical and figurative presence."*

It is matter of deep thankfulness that our Church utters no uncertain sound in her formu-

* Works: Bishop Heber's edition, vol. ix. p. 428.

laries in regard to those great verities which our Reformers asserted and established, and in defence of which many shed their blood. They took away nothing which their knowledge of Romish corruptions taught them might safely be retained, and in their desire to prevent schism, made the fewest possible changes consistent with the preservation of a pure faith. Can the children be safer than while they copy the example of their parent, speak with her plainness, avoid with her the ambiguities of language, which mystify, if they do not corrupt, the truth; nay, even abstain from some phrases lawful, lest they be wrested into wrongful meaning? Cranmer permitted the use of the word "altar" metaphorically; our Church acted more wisely in excluding it altogether from her formularies. It is the "table," the "Lord's table," the "holy table"—never the "altar." The spirit of Dean Aldrich's caution, in regard to one theological term, may be well applied to a more extensive class of debateable phrases. "The Church of England has wisely forborne to use the term of Real Presence in all the books that are set forth by her authority. . . . . So that if any Church-of-England man use it, he does more than the Church directs him; if any reject it, he has the Church's example to warrant him; and it would very much con-

tribute to the peace of Christendom if all men would write after so good a copy."*

Theological differences, it is to be remembered, are not now the subjects of private disputation, ventilated only by scholars in their closets. In a country like our own, where every man lives, not only under the observation of his neighbour, but, through the medium of the press, within the view of the whole community, there is no question connected with religious teaching or ministerial duty which is not liable to come in turn under public discussion as to the latitude allowed by our Church in regard to it. The latest point in dispute is Private Confession. What are its limits? To what cases does it extend? Is it general or particular, voluntary or of obligation?

The canons in force before the Reformation recognise the practice fully, and declare it to be of universal obligation. And these canons, by a proviso in 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, and by 1 Eliz. c. 1, s. 10, have a parliamentary authority given to them, as "still to be used and executed, provided that they are not contrariant or repugnant to the laws, statutes, and customs of this realm." The subsequent enactments which bear upon the use of confession have

* "Reply to Two Discourses."

been examined with much care in a recent publication, entitled "A brief Inquiry into the Law of the Church of England with respect to Private Confession." The author shows to satisfaction that the ancient canonical rules have been so far superseded by the course of legislation since the Reformation, and especially by the successive Acts of Uniformity in their bearing upon the Book of Common Prayer, that authority for the practice of private or auricular confession must be derived, if from any source, from the formularies of the Church itself.

What, then, is the direction of our formularies on this subject? Sometimes silence is said to speak louder than words. Now in the "Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments," in the second book, reference is made to the commonly called sacraments of the Church of Rome, which are not to be accounted as having the like nature of a sacrament with baptism and the Lord's Supper, alone retained as such by the order of the Church of England. Of the five other rites, excluded from the rank of sacraments, three—Orders, Matrimony, Confirmation—are to be retained as godly states of life, or as ordinances for the instruction, comfort, and edification of Christ's Church. The remaining two—Penance, of which Con-

fession is a noted part, and Extreme Unction—are passed over altogether, as not to be retained in any sense, either as sacraments or as rites. If, therefore, Extreme Unction is notoriously disallowed and disused, there seems no greater authority here for the retention of Private Confession. Both practices stand upon the same footing as not among the permitted rites "worthy to be set forth," as the expression of the Homily has it, "by public action and solemnity, by the ministry of the Church," though not to be reckoned among its sacraments, which are two only, as generally necessary to salvation.

Authority, then, is not given in the Homily. Is it then to be found in our ordinary liturgical services? There I read in the opening Exhortation at the beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer, that "the Scripture moveth us . . . . to acknowledge and confess our manifold sins and wickedness, and that we should not dissemble nor cloak them before the face of Almighty God, our Heavenly Father; but confess them with an humble, lowly, penitent, and obedient heart . . . . and although we ought at all times humbly to acknowledge our sins before God, yet ought we most chiefly so to do"—not in the private confessional, which might have been expected to be set forth as the chiefest

exercise of this duty, but — "when we assemble and meet together" in common prayer.

Or is authority given in the warning for the celebration of the Holy Communion, where, if any where, it may be expected to be found? There the communicant is exhorted to search out and examine his conscience — to examine his life and conversation by the rule of God's commandments; and whereinsoever he shall perceive himself to have offended, there to bewail his own sinfulness, and to confess himself to Almighty God; and, finally, if any be a grievous sinner, he is to repent him of his sins, or else come not to that holy table. No mention here of private confession as a means of preparation for the Holy Communion. And with these directions agrees the answer to the question in the Catechism as to what is required of them that come to the Lord's Supper, namely, to "examine themselves whether they repent them truly of their former sins, steadfastly purposing to lead a new life." No mention here again of private confession as an adjunct to self-examination and resolves of amendment.

But then, besides these general directions, there is another, on which reliance is placed. If by the means proposed the sinner cannot quiet his conscience, he is to "open his grief"

to a learned and discreet minister of God's word, that, by the ministry of God's holy word —a sentence frequently omitted in references to this passage—he may receive the benefit of absolution. And what this means may, perhaps, receive some light from the injunction coupled with the power of binding and loosing in the Ordination of Priests,—"Be thou a faithful dispenser of God's holy word and sacraments." The corresponding direction in the Homily is to the same effect as that in the Exhortation to Communion, with, perhaps, a little more latitude as to the party to be consulted in the emergency. "If any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned curate or pastor, or to some other godly learned man, and show the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them." They are to open their grief; they are to show their trouble or doubt—that which specially disquiets them, and so burthens their conscience that they cannot give it ease by the ordinary means. This is a provision for their relief from the weight which oppresses them, but it is not language which gives a warrant for that liberty of private confession, now contended for as lawful, and which, in the manner of its exercise, it is difficult to distinguish from the practice repudiated expressly and pointedly

by the Homily. "It is against the true Christian liberty that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins, as it hath been used heretofore in the time of blindness and ignorance."* It is this numbering of sins, obligatory before the Reformation, but forbidden by the homily, which introduces the practice of the interrogative system in receiving confession. The Romish priest puts his specific questions, lest the enumeration of any single sin should be omitted, and nullify the benefit of absolution. "We must take heed," say they, "that we forget nothing: for all those sins that are forgotten may not be forgiven."† Our Church instructs the minister of God's word to move the sinner to open his grief, to listen to his own spontaneous disclosure of the weighty matter which troubles him; but he is not bidden,—by inference, I think he is forbidden,—to probe him by suggestive inquiries, or to conjecture causes which may be imaginary and foreign to the present distress.

It is important, however, to refer to the history of this part of the service. Two Books of Common Prayer were compiled and set forth by order of Parliament, in the reign of Edward

* Homily on Repentance.

† Latimer's "Sermon on 3rd Sunday after Epiphany," vol. ii. 398.

the Sixth,—the first, in January 7th, 1549; the second, being a revision of the first, in April, 1552, with order for its use throughout the kingdom, from the feast of All Saints following.* The variations show the progress of the Reformation, and are well worthy of attentive consideration. Of those which bear upon the present point, the following are the most remarkable: In the first book the direction is to this effect—"If there be any of you whose conscience is troubled and grieved in anything . . . let him come to me . . . and confess and open his sin secretly . . . that of us (as of the ministers of God and of the Church) he may receive comfort and absolution . . . requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest; nor those also which think needful or convenient, for the quietness of their own consciences, particularly to open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God, and the general confession to the Church." In the second book the exhortation is altered to a form which is substantially the same as that in use at present, sanctioned and established at the last revision

* Cardwell's "Two Books of Common Prayer compared."

in 1661. In this book, first, the penitent whose conscience is disquieted is no longer directed "to confess and open his sin and grief *secretly*," but simply "to open his grief," as it stands at present. Secondly, the words, "that of us (as of the ministers of God and of the Church,) he may receive comfort and absolution," are altered to, "that by the ministry of God's Holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution:" "to show," says Wheatley, "that the benefit of absolution (of absolution, I presume, from inward guilt,) was not to be received by the pronouncing of any form, but by a due application and ministry of God's Holy Word,"—referring to John, xv. 3, *Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you;* and to 2 Cor. v. 19, *God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.* And in agreement with this, the Rubric in the first book ordering the same form of absolution to be used in all private confessions, which is provided in the office for the Visitation of the Sick, was left out at the revision. And then, thirdly, the caution to the communicant, who is satisfied with a general confession, not to be offended with such as use auricular and secret confession to the priest, is omitted alto-

gether. These are material changes, which mark the mind of the Reformed Church with a distinctness which cannot be mistaken. And in directing our attention to them with a careful scrutiny, we shall be only acting in the spirit of the advice given by the compilers of our Liturgy in the Preface affixed to the Book of Common Prayer at the last revision: "If any man who shall desire a more particular account of the several alterations in any part of the Liturgy shall take the pains to compare the present book with the former, we doubt not but the reason of the change will easily appear."

Then, further, the case for which provision is thus made, is clearly exceptional. Self-examination, confession to God, repentance with amendment of life, are the ordinary requirements; these failing to quiet conscience, a further remedy is prescribed, not applicable and not recommended under all circumstances, but reserved specially for an extreme emergency. And so, in the Rubric in the Visitation of the Sick, after sundry directions, it is added, "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter." And for such exceptional case, among the occasional prayers at the end of the service,—

prayers obviously not to be offered indiscriminately on all occasions of using the office, but only at certain times,—after the prayers for a sick child, or person under small hope of recovery, or at the point of departure, provision is made for another peculiar category in a prayer "for persons troubled in mind or in conscience," meeting the special case of one who has confessed the weighty matter with which his soul was burthened.

If, then, this special confession to the priest be not obligatory, in all cases, before Communion or even on the sick-bed, there is absolutely no shadow of authority in the formularies of our Church for the practice of habitual private confession, sick or well, with or without some disquieting grief to be opened.* The abuses to which it has led are matters of history. They are among the most notorious offences of the Romish system. Even with all her appliances, with the safeguards thrown around the communications of the priest with the penitent, by the comparative publicity of the confessional in the open church, and by the definite rules for his guidance, it is "a perpetual danger," in the words of Jeremy Taylor, "by which he that loves it may chance to perish. And of this," he adds, "there have been too many sad

* See Appendix B.

examples remarked, evidencing that this private confession hath been the occasion and the opportunity of the vilest crimes." *

The system of the confessional is as foreign to the spirit of the Gospel as to the manly common sense and independent mind of the great mass of the members of the English Church. The spirit of the Gospel is "repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ." The mind of our congregations will not tolerate an empty formalism in the place of these life-giving truths, or the substitution of an unscriptural confession to sinful man, of like passions with themselves, in the stead of sorrow for sin before God, "with groanings that cannot be uttered," true conversion of heart, and holiness of life. They will never endure to see the weaker members of their families subjected to an authority which, if it does not taint and confuse the moral sense, subdues the mind to the extinction of all independent volition, and chains it captive with passive submission to the will of a spiritual director.

And then, mark the consequences, too much to be dreaded as probable, if not inevitable. There will be a jealousy attaching itself to those domiciliary visits which form so important a part of your pastoral duty. The cottage door

* "Dissuasive from Popery," part ii. s. ii. vol. xi. p. 35.

will be closed against you, or averted faces will meet you, and suspicion cloud the brow of your parishioners as you enter. That familiar intercourse which has so often cleared a doubt, or solved a difficulty, or thrown a light upon your public teaching, will be restrained or rejected altogether, and you will find yourselves paralysed in one of the best arms of your ministry. For such a loss, the setting up of a confessional will be a sorry compensation.

Is this deference to the world's opinion? Is it a shrinking from the discharge of duty in a particular department of ministerial work, because it is unpopular? If it be so, I earnestly pray that we may be delivered from a spirit so unworthy and so time-serving. But "we have not so learned Christ." We have not thus read the apostolical lesson. True it is, that one who was not a "whit behind the very chiefest apostles" has bidden us look beyond the world's view of what is truth to the court of highest appeal. "With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged .... of man's judgment ..... but He that judgeth me is the Lord." But how does he preface this appeal to the paramount jurisdiction of his Divine Master? "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." * What

* 1 Cor. iv. 1–4.

we want as such ministers and stewards is a more spiritual discernment of truth, that we may make a more simple, clear, apostolic proclamation of it to our flocks. The most efficient minister is he in whom the word of Christ dwells most richly in all wisdom. Then is his storehouse fullest of things new and old; then the whole treasury of Divine grace is poured forth in most gracious abundance; then unsearchable riches are at his command to minister to the indigence of each soul that is under his charge; then will his parish realise the possession of that precious blessing which God promised as His choicest gift to penitent Israel—"I will give you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding." * We have it on the authority of God Himself, that the pastor who feeds is the pastor after God's own heart. Christ makes it the burthen of His special commission and the test of the pastor's love: "Feed My sheep. Feed My lambs."

And this is the safest criterion for judging of the reality of our work, and of the soundness of the foundation on which it rests. Are we feeding the flock of Christ out of love to the Divine Shepherd? No heart work without heart love. Legislation can only bear upon

* Jer. iii. 15.

externals. It may provide means of progress, but it cannot set the wheels in motion. It may build churches, but it cannot put fire upon the altar. It may multiply schools, but it cannot cleanse the way of a young man, or teach him from a child to know the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make him wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. It may give man's word, and at the human bidding great may be the company of the preachers, but it cannot make the inefficient man useful, it cannot convert indolence into activity, or transmute the formal, the unscriptural, the unspiritual into the able and faithful minister of the New Testament. God is the sole Dispenser of His own grace. God alone quickens His own word from the letter that killeth to the Spirit that giveth life.

May He, my Reverend Brethren, grant to you these heavenly gifts in fullest measure! May He acknowledge you as His true servants in His acceptance of your ministrations, and testify to their faithfulness, as when He said of him whom He was about to send unto the Gentiles,—"Behold he prayeth." Join with me, brethren beloved in the Lord, in this mutual prayer for yourselves, for each other, for me. Join in brotherly love and unity of spirit, in commending each the other to God and to the

word of His grace, which is able to give us an inheritance among all them that are sanctified.

"O Almighty God, who by Thy Son Jesus Christ didst give to Thy Apostle St. Peter many excellent gifts, and commandedst him earnestly to feed Thy flock; Make, we beseech Thee, all bishops and pastors diligently to preach Thy Holy Word, and the people obediently to follow the same, that they may receive the crown of everlasting glory; through Jesus Christ our Lord." Amen.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

Appendix A. (Page 28.)

Extract of a Letter from an Incumbent of a small Benefice with 280 *souls at the last Census, in the Diocese of Winchester, to the Bishop.*

". . . . . I am induced to state the case of my own school, bearing, as it does, upon connexion with Government.

"When I came here in 1852, I found a most incompetent mistress teaching seven children. I dismissed her as soon as possible, and, having raised the subscriptions from 2*l.* to 12*l.* a-year, was in a position to offer 20*l.* a-year.

"Knowing the great advantage the school in the parish I came from derived from Government, I endeavoured to get a certificated mistress. I applied to the Salisbury Training School, the one at Brighton, and the Home and Colonial in London, and received the same reply from each,—that no certificated mistress ever went out under 35*l.*, besides augmentation.

"I was therefore obliged to be content with one who had only had some training. I get a person of about nineteen, who stays two years, and then leaves; and, unpromising as this sounds, the school has prospered, and the numbers have gradually increased to thirty-three.

"The last mistress, however, remained three years, and was to have gone up for a certificate in December, and the Committee of Council sent 50*s.* as Capitation-money in consequence: but, unfortunately, she has had an offer of marriage, and has not returned since harvest; and if she had got her certificate, I could not have expected her to stay above a year at the salary I give.

"The Capitation-money is the only direct advantage which Government affords to schools, and of that it is usual to give the master or mistress a portion.

"Mr. Watkins, in the Minutes, 1857–58, p. 294, speaks of the augmentation as the private fortune of the master or mistress.

"If Government would continue inspection and capitation-grants to well-conducted village-schools, unable to obtain the services of certificated persons, I think much advantage every way would result. Moderate qualifications are sufficient for such schools, and it is not those with the highest certificates who make the best teachers. Mr. Brookfield says (Minutes, 1857–58, p. 387):—"The preponderance of efficiency, indeed, is somewhat, though very slightly, in favour of the third, or lowest class of certificates."

"According to a memorial in the September number of the National Society's monthly paper it appears, that out of 522 schools in the diocese of Bath and Wells, only 81 possess certificated masters and mistresses. The 441 remaining schools are in the poorest parishes. The reason given is, the smallness of the population in the rural parishes, and that the resources are generally in proportion to the population.

"This is exactly the case of the school here: it is too poor to derive any help from Government, for the 50*s.* received this year is quite an exception: it is the first, and perhaps the last annual grant."

Appendix B. (Page 69.)

I confine myself to the evidence supplied by the formularies of our Church, because to those who have solemnly endorsed them by subscription such an appeal must be sufficient. It would be superfluous to say to the audience addressed in this charge, that our Reformers, while they vindicated the original doctrine, restored the original practice of the Church. But in nothing was the work of the Reformers more entirely a restoration, than in the department under review.

The verdict of ecclesiastical controversy is all but unanimous, that *Confession*, as now defined, and now imposed by the Church of Rome, was unknown in the earliest times; and the unanimity would have been complete, had not Bellarmine and other apologists for Rome maintained a different opinion. It can scarcely be regretted, indeed, that they have done so, since their opposition has called forth such a cloud of witnesses on the other side. For otherwise, we might never have had the profound researches of Daillé,* combating in detail the positions of Bellarmine, and Petavius, and Tournely; and proving by thirty cogent arguments, that the doctrine in question was established in the thirteenth century, and not before.

We might not have had that collation of authorities exhibited by our learned Bingham,† and embracing the testimony of Chrysostom, and Basil, and Hilary, and Ambrose, and Austin, of Maximus Taurinensis, and of Cassian.

We might not have had the labours of such authors as

* "Dallæus de Auric. Latinorum Confess."

† "Christian Antiq." book xviii. c. iii.

Hooker,* and Jeremy Taylor,† proving that that doctrine "is new even in the Church of Rome itself, and not esteemed any part of the Catholic religion before the Council of Trent."

Nor might we have had the services of more modern writers in establishing the same point; as, for instance, Dr. Pusey, who, in his edition of Tertullian, has given a most elaborate note to prove that *Exomologesis* is not confession, nor confession itself what Rome understands it to be. To quote one example in the editor's words:—

"If Romanists would fairly consider this, there could be no way in which confession to God alone, exclusive of man, could be expressed, if not here. St. Chrysostom says, "to God alone"—"apart, in private"—"to Him who knoweth beforehand"—"no one knowing"—"no one present save Him who knoweth"—"God alone seeing"—"unwitnessed"—"not to man"—"not to a fellow-servant"—"within"—"in the conscience"—"in the memory"—"judging thyself" (in lieu of the priest being the judge)—"proving ourselves—each himself, not the one to the other"—"in church to God" (*i. e.* in the general confession). Accordingly, one Romanist writer boldly pronounces all these passages spurious; and, since they are unquestionable, another, of great name, Petavius, condemns them as "being uttered in a declamatory way to the ignorant multitude, for the sake of impressiveness;" but certainly, poor as such an excuse would be for what, according to Romanists, is false teaching, the passages are too numerous and too uniform to admit of it."‡

* "No, no: these opinions have youth in their countenance; antiquity knew them not, it never thought nor dreamed of them."—*Hooker's Works, Keble's edition*, book vi. c. xiv.

† Works, vol. xi. p. 11. Heber's edition, 1839.

‡ "Library of the Fathers." Oxford, 1842. Vol. x. p. 401.

London:—Printed by G. Barclay, Castle St. Leicester Sq.

GAYLAMOUNT
AMPHLET BINDER
Manufactured by
GAYLORD BROS. Inc.
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.